

# UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

<sup>2</sup>HENRY <sup>3</sup>L. <sup>1</sup>WEST,

of the  
National Security League /

<sup>8</sup>  
U.S.

<sup>5</sup>CHARLES <sup>6</sup>T. <sup>4</sup>HALLINAN,

of the  
American Union Against Militarism /

---

Reprinted by  
THE AMERICAN UNION AGAINST MILITARISM  
Westory Building, Washington, D. C.  
from

THE ARBITRATOR

P. O. Box 42, Wall St. Station, New York City  
(See Back Cover)

# The Arbitrator

DEDICATED TO THE IMPARTIAL DISCUSSION OF PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

ISSUED MONTHLY THROUGH

THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

IN THE INTERESTS OF PROGRESSIVE THOUGHT AND SOCIAL ADVANCE

\$1. a year

25 cents for 3 months

\$5. for co-operating subscription

P. O. Box 42, Wall St. Station, New York City

---

## The Free Religious Association of America

General Headquarters: Walker Building, Boston, Mass.

### A Brief Statement of Principles and Aims

The Free Religious Association was organized in 1867 and has had a distinguished history. It is national and international in its scope, having officers and members in the various states of the Union, in Canada, England and elsewhere. The name of Ralph Waldo Emerson heads its list of charter members.

It has no "creed" or formulation of ideas which are regarded as possessing finality, but holds that the scientific method should be applied in studying the facts of the moral and religious life, and that for each individual, after due consideration of the convictions of others, the final authority as to the right or wrong of any opinion or action should be his own conscientious and reasoned judgment.

One of its chief functions has been the maintenance of a free platform for the discussion of all subjects affecting the general welfare. In addition, it promotes the systematic study of social questions to the end that there may be created a sense of individual and social responsibility for the removing of unjust social conditions. It also serves as a common meeting ground for those in sympathy with liberal opinion and the various forward movements.

Its membership includes men, women and churches of the free spirit of the various denominations, many non-Christian religionists in synagogue, ethical culture society and elsewhere, free thinkers, social radicals, teachers and students in our schools and colleges, public officials, wage-earners, physicians, lawyers, authors, publicists and other far-sighted and public spirited men and women.

Its officers include John Haynes Holmes, Stephen S. Wise, Frank Oliver Hall, William Lloyd Garrison, Jr., William Trufant Foster, George W. Nasmyth, Anna Garlin Spencer, Emanuel Sternheim and other leading thinkers and workers.

---

A membership contribution of \$2 entitles to all publications. Supporting membership, \$5 to \$10. Sustaining membership, \$10 to \$25.

*For further information, literature, etc.*

Address: GEORGE GROVER MILLS, *General Secretary*, 120 Boylston Street, Boston.

# UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

By HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST

*Executive Secretary of the National Security League*

Citizenship means everything or nothing. The word is but an empty sound to the fur-clad Eskimo or the jungle creature in darkest Africa. To us, who enjoy life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under the American flag, it means everything—the peaceful and orderly conduct of our business, the safety from intrusion of our homes, the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences. The value of our citizenship depends largely, however, upon the strength and solidity of our nation. The Government which gives us citizenship worthy of the name must be able to guarantee us all the privileges and honors which the word implies. It is important, wherever a citizen of the United States may be, whether on land or on sea, that the hand uplifted to do him injury shall be stayed by the warning voice, "Take heed what thou doest, for this man is an American."

We cannot, however, hope to secure respect unless we can command respect. It is unfortunate, but none the less true, that the possession or exercise of the highest mental and moral attributes does not insure safety. No nation, no matter how carefully it may observe the Golden Rule, can rely upon its own good conduct as a positive insurance for peace. The recent war demonstrates that fact. To follow the arguments of pacifists to their logical conclusion would be to disband our police force on the theory that crimes would no more be committed and fail to provide for a fire department because fires could never again occur. Common sense revolts against such an absurdity. The fact is, however, that we have not carried into our national life the ordinary precautions of daily existence. We have apparently forgotten the old axiom that self-preservation is the first law of nature. We have allowed indifference to take the place of adequate preparedness and supreme self-satisfaction to blind our judgment to the necessity for defense. We have been hiding our heads in the sand.

Ignoring the lessons which experience has taught us in every war in which we have engaged, we have allowed ourselves, as soon as peace has been declared, to lapse into a self-satisfied and complaisant mood, untroubled by thought of the future. What has happened before is likely to occur again. The great war having ended, there is a danger that we will again go to sleep in the comforting belief that wars are forever over. We will hear much talk of permanent peace and the brotherhood of men; but none the less the belief that this is the last war which the world will witness is a fatal delusion. As long as human passions remain unchanged, as long as lust of power or love of land or greed for commercial expansion exist, so long will there be war. At any time we may be forced, even against our will, to choose between defense or surrender.

When such an alternative is presented, as it will be in some future period, we must be prepared to defend our lives and our liberties. We cannot be insured from attack by our geographical position, our wealth, or our numbers. These are our weaknesses, not our strength. We have over 21,000 miles of exposed coast line, and the time has passed when we can regard either the Atlantic or the Pacific as a protection. The ocean is no longer a barrier, but a highway. Our wealth will excite envy. We are rich beyond the dreams of avarice, and God help us if we should prove as weak as we are rich. Nor can we rely upon treaties, international law or international morality. Treaties of themselves are not worth the paper they are written upon. International law changes daily with the whim of circumstance. Besides this, law means a court to interpret and a police power to enforce, and should an international court be provided, our power must necessarily be as great as that of any nation composing the court or we

5-6-19. 9.8. Revision.

will fail to do justice to others or, what is more important, have justice done to us. There is no international morality. The code of ethics which obtains between peaceful and law-abiding individuals entirely disappears when nations are concerned.

If we are not to become as helpless as China and if we expect future generations to enjoy the blessings and privileges which our forefathers bequeathed to us, we must be prepared to defend them at all times and under all circumstances. How is this defense to be provided? Only through Universal Compulsory Military Training and Service. This assertion rests upon a logical and incontrovertible foundation, as follows:

First: That the United States will never possess a navy sufficiently large to control and defend its extensive coastlines.

Second: That American tradition and sentiment will prevent the creation and support of a permanent regular army large enough to combat successfully the enemy forces which could be landed upon our shores.

Granting that these two things are true, the defense of our country must inevitably depend upon an adequate force of citizen soldiery pursuing peaceful vocations under normal conditions, but thoroughly trained and equipped to meet immediately an emergency of threatened danger.

The navy is only the first line of defense. \* \* \* We can never have a navy large enough to dominate both oceans. Time and cost make this prohibitive. We must, therefore, rely upon some other means of adequate protection.

We cannot hope to find this protection in an enormous standing army. As a matter of fact, we ought not to. To create and maintain a regular army of a million men would be an enormous and useless tax upon the American people, besides which it would be entirely out of harmony with all our traditions and ideals. It would represent the idea of militarism which is repugnant to the American mind. Even should such an army be authorized, it is doubtful, as experience has already shown, whether it could be recruited. More than this, the lesson of the European war is that we cannot rely upon the hired, mercenary army. All the European nations have learned that the hope of ultimate salvation rests with their man-power and that this power must be utilized to the last degree. England has been compelled to yield, both in practice and principle, to this necessity, in the meantime having paid dearly for failing to heed the words of wisdom spoken into her ears for at least two decades. We must insure our own future safety through the preparation which she ignored.

Without a navy that can meet and destroy anything and everything, which is impossible, and without a regular army of overwhelming size, which is equally out of the question, how are we to guarantee our future national security? The answer must be found in a trained citizen army—not a volunteer army of a few patriotic, unselfish, self-sacrificing men who regard devotion to their country as a duty, while thousands of other men, better fitted for service physically and financially, remain at home—but an army in which all men serve alike and render to their country an obligation of service in return for the privileges which they enjoy.

The idea of a volunteer army has departed forever. \* \* \* If we are to enjoy security in the future we must have men trained and equipped to meet and overcome any invading force. We can only have this protection through universal military training.

Manhood service and manhood suffrage must go together. We utter the sentence as if it were something new and novel, forgetting that in the early days of our national history, the idea was axiomatic. \* \* \* Universal military training and service is the only system which is purely democratic. Thomas Jefferson, recognized as the founder and patron saint of the Democratic party, emphasized this point of view. "We must train and classify the whole of our



male citizens," he wrote to Monroe in 1813, after he had learned the lesson of unpreparedness in the war of 1812, "and make military instruction a regular part of collegiate education. We can never be safe till this is done." \* \* \*

Being naturally peace-loving, we indulge in the hope that if we are good to others they will be good to us. Being naturally independent, the words "compulsory" and "obligatory" have an abhorrent sound, although we accept Governmental compulsion in a thousand ways. More than all, being naturally optimistic, hap-hazard and God-trusting, we have through all these years failed to realize how essential to our well-being was the wisdom of our forefathers and we have paid in every war we have conducted a fearful penalty in lives and money for our unpreparedness.

Fortunately, in seeking to adopt a system of universal military training and service in this country, we do not have to grope blindly along unknown paths. Switzerland, the little republic of the Old World, affords us an object lesson. \* \* \* When the great European war began, they mobilized nearly 400,000 men in forty-eight hours, and today there is not a hostile foot upon Swiss territory, lives and property have been protected and Swiss womanhood has remained inviolate. The men who voted for military training in Switzerland in 1848 are dead and gone but their good deeds live after them. It is safe to say that today, after seventy years of experience, not one vote would be cast in Switzerland against the system. If the United States should wait forty-four years or a hundred years—and God grant it may be many years—before an opportunity occurred to test the value of the system, the fact that then we would be able to protect our lives, our property and our liberties, would be worth all the time and money expended. The Swiss army is enrolled, as ours would be, for defense, not for offense; and every student of the Swiss army agrees that the Swiss system is the living refutation of the charge that military training antagonizes good citizenship. The Swiss is, above all things, a free man, and there is no taint of militarism in his nation.

Side by side with Switzerland in the adoption of compulsory military training stands France. If France had not adopted the system years ago the Germans would have been in Paris today. \* \* \*

There is a vital issue now before this country—the question whether we shall have a people's army to defend the people. The question must be decided in the affirmative. No one doubts the patriotism and the capability of our young men. The events of the past year, however, prove that loyal and capable men cannot be instantly converted into effective soldiers. There is a vast and a fatal difference between willingness and readiness. In England, under stress of war conditions, nine months were the minimum of necessary training. In this country, also under war pressure, we are taking a longer time, while expert service, like coast artillery, requires three years of preparation. Under our present laws all men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five are liable to military service. We ask that the Government shall see to it that these men are made ready to render this service. A demand for instant duty by a hastily improvised army would mean that our young men would go forth to defeat and slaughter, brave sacrifices on the altar of unpreparedness, but sacrifices none the less. This is not rhetoric, but fact; and God grant that we do not postpone its realization until the dawning of some evil day.

Such a system of universal training will do something more for us as a nation, however, than guarantee us protection for our lives, our homes and our liberties. It offers, in addition, manifold and striking advantages which will hasten the day of its acceptance. Several of these advantages are self-apparent. The first is the fraternity and democracy of shoulder-to-shoulder service. This has been demonstrated by the experiences of the cantonments where men of all ranks of life mingle in splendid equality and where caste is eliminated. \* \* \*

The volunteer army system is undemocratic because it imposes obligations upon a comparatively few who are willing to serve and come forward in time of need. To be really democratic our burdens must fall equally upon all classes and conditions of people. There is no doubt that universal military training is absolutely democratic.

Another reason for universal military training is the benefit which will accrue to the young men of the nation through physical development. This fact is recognized by medical organizations and is demonstrated by the changed physical conditions of the men in the cantonments. Twenty-nine per cent of the men called in the draft were physically unfit. If we are to continue virile as a nation we must elevate our physical standards and if we are to be a strong-thinking, law-abiding people we must learn the value of self-restraint.

Universal military training will also give to the individual a practical demonstration of the value of efficiency, the wisdom of economy and the necessity of team-work. It will teach him administrative thoroughness and discipline and thus elevate to a high plane his productiveness. Such training will also give to each citizen a keener sense of his relationship to his country and thus enlarge and deepen his patriotism. With the knowledge that he is rendering service will come a closer appreciation of what his country is doing for him. It will bring him into closer relationship with his Government. This is especially desirable in the case of the foreign-born citizen who regards government as something instituted to repress and control him and who does not realize that he is a part of the Government. The immigrant will also learn in the training camp that this country will not tolerate divided allegiance and he will be given larger opportunity to know our history and ideals through a more thorough acquaintance with the English language.

We know that the American soldier in the past has at the proper time laid down his arms and returned with civic conscientiousness to the pursuits of peace. The man is a fool who fears that the American soldier of the future, after he has been successfully called upon to defend his country, will depart from the pathway in which his father trod.

Not until we obtain the full measure of protection which necessity demands will our future be secure. When this has been done, we may feel that the Monroe doctrine, which has been our national policy as well as our protection for more than a hundred years, will not have to be abandoned. We may then be assured that the Panama canal, built by American brains and energy and money, will not pass into foreign control. We will then know that the privileges secured for us with blood and sacrifice will not have to be surrendered. We will then be able to preserve unshackled the freedom which crowns this nation as with a halo. Above all, we will then know that the spirit of democracy, finding its noblest development in this land of ours, will remain a vital, living force, securely guarded against any foe which knows not liberty. These are the things which an all-wise Providence has committed to our care. With tremendous trust comes tremendous responsibility. Proudly we accept the glory of the one; with courage, self-denial and sacrifice we take up the burden of the other.

---

### IF YOU SUBSCRIBE

to THE ARBITRATOR you will be kept posted on various proposals for social betterment, discussed in an interesting manner by experts.

Proposed for future discussion are: Medical Prophylaxis of Venereal Disease; Compulsory Veracity in Newspapers; Uniform Divorce Laws; Old Age Pensions; Limitations of Incomes; Religious Beliefs; Democracy (article promised by Louis F. Post); Freethought; Amnesty for Political Prisoners, etc.

A Questionnaire on Religious Doctrine will be sent to anyone on request, the summary to appear in the March or April number.

# COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING: THE NEGATIVE

By CHARLES T. HALLINAN

*Secretary of the American Union Against Militarism, Washington, D. C.*

Those who demand the establishment of compulsory military training and service in this country have been agitating their case since 1914. They have had ample time in which to draft and submit to Congress bills embodying their ideas. It is fair to assume, then, that the four bills which have been introduced in Congress, largely at the instance of these various "defence" organizations during this extended period, represent substantially, in *type* if not in *amount*, what the proponents of universal military training desire to see adopted.

The four bills thus far projected into the ring are known in military circles as the first Chamberlain bill, the so-called Moseley bill, and the Army War College bill, all introduced in the Sixty-fourth Congress; and the revised or second Chamberlain bill, introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress. These are the only measures which have had sufficient prestige to secure committee hearings and general "patriotic" endorsement throughout the country.

An examination of them, therefore, ought to yield a pretty concrete idea of what *sort* of compulsory military training system is proposed for this country, and I cordially recommend a study of these bills to those good folks who, on Sundays, solemnly read Dr. Charles W. Eliot in the "supplements" on the beauties of the "Swiss system". I haven't space to describe those bills in detail, but I want briefly to discuss their major negative characteristic which is that *not one of the four bills* bears the slightest resemblance to the Swiss system.

Now, this is certainly a singular situation. Because for four years now we have been flooded with after-dinner oratory about the beauties of the Swiss system; the metropolitan newspapers, with the honorable exceptions of the "New York World" and the "New York Evening Post," have devoted columns to extolling it, teaching their small-town brethren in the Middle West to do likewise; for four years now Mr. Roosevelt has thundered his demands that the Swiss system be established instantane. And yet, during all this period of oratory and newspaper clamor, the proponents of compulsory military training have never had the decency or the good faith to introduce in Congress a bill modeled upon the system which they applaud in public!

What is the Swiss system, anyway? Why, it is the militia system, the sort of system we had in this country in Colonial days,—Massachusetts' "muster day" is a relic of it. Perhaps its nearest analogue in the whole Western world outside of Switzerland is the National Guard system of the United States which the militarists in this country have been ceaselessly traducing for the past four years.

In Switzerland the youth comes out for a few weeks military training in company with his neighbors, elbow to elbow; his company officers are neighbors, more or less under neighborhood pressure to be decent to him. His canton, or state, holds the purse-strings and exercises a jealous vigilance that the central military organization shall not encroach upon the rights of citizens or upon the cantonal budget. So fearful are the Swiss of the development of a swaggering military caste that they have a law providing that in time of peace no officer shall hold rank higher than that of colonel. It was only a few weeks ago that the newspapers carried a tiny cable dispatch from Switzerland to the effect that the General who had been in charge of the Swiss mobilization during the Great War had, with the signing of the armistice, handed in his commission and resumed the rank and pay of colonel. Fancy General Leonard Wood doing this? Fancy any of our 138 Brigadier-generals consenting to retire, without a severe congressional fight, to the rank and pay they enjoyed in peace time!

Now these four bills which I have mentioned as embodying, presumably, the sort of compulsory military training which our governing classes propose for this country, are based, as I have said, not on the Swiss or militia system but, quite frankly, on the Prussian system. Each and every one of these bills would take the youth away from his home and his neighbors, deprive him of his civilian rights, place him under centralized military control and at enforced military labor, subject him to court-martial for every infraction of discipline under a system of military law and administration so crude and one-sided, so caste-ridden and mediaeval, that the President of the American Bar Association has publicly denounced it as "neither law nor justice",\* and *then*—now get this, for this is important—each of these bills would enroll him permanently in the "reserve" to be automatically called to the colors in time of war.

Don't forget that point! Some meticulous folks like to argue that there is a difference between universal *training* and universal *service*. So there is, but not one of these bills makes any such distinction. These bills exact both training and service. Under them the youth who graduates from a conscript training camp remains a conscript until he is forty-five. No provision is made for Congressional decision as to whether conscription shall be adopted or not. No provision is made for draft boards to inquire tenderly into the man's domestic or economic conditions. No, when the President and Congress declare war and the General Staff, in its wisdom, orders a mobilization by "classes" (How European that sounds!) the American citizen is up against the same iron rod as the German citizen; he kisses his family good bye and marches away. He is part of a vast military machine.

As to just how vast a military machine, the authorities differ but I have seen no estimate that ran less than 6,000,000 men, counting active and reserves, after a few years of the proposed system. The General Staff, in its famous *Statement of a Proper Military Policy for the United States*, of December 6, 1916, talks exultantly of an army ranging from 9,000,000 to 12,000,000 men. By the way, send to your Congressman or to the War Department for a copy of that document, all ye of naive faith in the intrinsic pacifism of the American military machine! Get it and read it, and after you have read it try to figure out one single solitary feature in which the permanent conscription system—misnamed universal training system—proposed for this country differs from the hated German system. *You can not find one.*

Of course the bills I refer to provide only for six months' or a year's training whereas the German system calls for two years. But let us not be self-deceived. These bills ask for what their backers think they can get. Without exception the proponents of compulsory military training and service all seem to show a vast respect for the professional opinion of the General Staff, and the General Staff, you know, says that eventually *we too must adopt two years' compulsory peace time training*. It seems to me fairly obvious that with the Army officers themselves professionally and financially interested in pushing for a larger and larger army and for a longer and "more effective" period of training, with the "defence" societies and the "patriotic" societies and the metropolitan newspapers all paying the most flattering homage to the wisdom of the General Staff,—it seems to me fairly obvious, I say, that *if* we let the camel's head into the tent, *if* we concede, for the sake of peace and to have an end to the racket, the principle of conscript training in peace time, we shall be confronted, year in and year out, with a ceaseless propaganda for the gradual extension of this training period until it takes two years out of the life of every able-bodied youth. But long before that time we shall have in full flower here that "drilling, trampling foolery" that dragged Europe and dragged America up the Golgotha of War.

But suppose our militarists, disturbed at these revelations, should change

\*See "New York World," Jan. 6, and Jan. 19, 1919.



their tactics and promise to support a bill actually modeled upon the Swiss system? Wouldn't that be all right? Well, under the Swiss system the youth who has completed his training is presented with his gun by the cantonal government and he keeps it, together with ammunition, in his house. *The priceless symbol of the militia; see Amendment II of our Constitution for a similar instance.* But do the propertied classes in this country intend to permit the working class to carry guns? Do they intend to permit the members of the Farmers' Nonpartisan League to own their own guns? Most certainly not! Don't let anybody talk to you about the Swiss system without educating him as to the radical steps to which the Swiss have been driven to keep their system democratic. Ask your ill-informed tormentor whether he really means what he says. If we are going to have Prussian militarism here, well and good, but let's have an end to this ridiculous cis-Alpine camouflage.

Advocates of compulsory military training always talk, in public, as though they were greatly concerned over our physical well-being. If they are, why don't they broaden their bills to include *all* our male youths (to be generous and leave out the girls!) instead of merely all "*able-bodied* youths"? Why do they and their professional military advisors count so confidently, in their estimates, on rejecting the very weaklings who, by their public argument, ought to have the training? Why do they leave out precisely those narrow-chested fellows whose lackadaisical appearance, in poolroom and bar room, on the bell-hops' bench and behind the counter, so stirs to anguish our "fit" and well-fed classes? I grant that we have been far too careless in this country of physical training; we have exploited our youth cruelly and stupidly, but the remedy is to begin with childhood, to provide skilled physical training from the school grades up, to improve home and recreational and industrial conditions. The remedy, most emphatically, does *not* lie in suddenly subjecting our neglected youth to a period of dull and distasteful military routine coupled, more or less incidentally and without any scientific regard for the individual's need, with conventional "setting up exercises" as conducted in the average American camp by the average bored lieutenant. Physical training *is* a desideratum; then let us go at it right. Let us pass a federal act for the encouragement of physical training in the public schools throughout the country. Let us raise thousands of well-trained physical instructors. Let us go at it directly, and not indirectly through a measure which does not pretend, on the face of it, to touch the very classes which need this training the most.

Then there is our old friend, the argument that we need compulsory military training for the sake of the sense of "discipline" it implants. Waiving, for the nonce, the question as to why we should suddenly begin to sacrifice to these new ideals of Prussian discipline those qualities of independence and initiative and self-reliance and co-operation which defeated Prussian automatism on the field of battle; waiving the argument *ad hominem*, as to which class is fundamentally the more law-abiding—the middle-class youth of our country or our capitalist classes!—waiving all sorts of questions, pertinent and impertinent, let us examine this, the stock romantic assumption of the militarists, that their training makes for "discipline."

I dispute that. What is the evidence for it? If military training turns out an individual of such irreproachable public bearing, why is it that the enlisted man fails so lamentably to display those qualities? The enlisted man in the American Army has not been, up to the time of this war, a popular figure. In fact there has been so much social prejudice against him that Congress and the various states have had to pass "civil rights acts" protecting him, the beneficiary of this remarkable military training, from invidious discrimination by hotels and theaters. What's the matter? Hotel and theaters have never discriminated against school teachers, or traveling men, or bar tenders; why then, up to recent



years have they discriminated against the enlisted man? Isn't the answer—in part, at least—the fact that observation had taught them that the enlisted man on his infrequent excursions to town, reacted so violently from military discipline that he has, in a pathetic number of cases, been a disorderly and unwelcome visitor?

But it goes further than that. My own observation is that military training is not only superficial, to be thrown off with relief when the pressure is removed, but that its tendency—so far as it has any tendency—is the very opposite of sound civic training. Here is the great City of New York, packed with four million people, racial groups of all sorts and conditions, and all of them deeply moved by the War and the draft. Is there not something significant in the fact that this great cosmopolitan city, with passions running high, has had, during the past strenuous year and a half, *two street mobs, and two only*, and that both of these street mobs were composed wholly of soldiers and sailors? Turn to the files of the New York "Times" for November 26, 1918, and again for November 27, and read there of the way the soldiers broke through the thin veneer of military discipline; read how they broke up two peaceable public meetings, in-doors; read how they bulldozed men and insulted women. It is all down there, in black and white. Ah, but you may argue that those were boys from near-by camps who had not had *enough* military training! Enough training for what? Enough to bring them up to the degree of decent, orderly civic behavior of the civilian? That is an astonishing circle for an argument to traverse, but is there any escape from it? And if more and more military training will alone bring the man in uniform up to the normal standards of civic behavior, what are we to think of the over-seas veterans who, according to the Associated Press, mobbed the suffrage pickets in Lafayette Square in Washington, D. C., in January of this year? As a matter of cold hard fact, the whole tendency of military training—if it has any tendency other than constantly to inflame and irritate its victim—the whole tendency of military training, I repeat, is to teach those who yield themselves docilely to it that the uniform is superior to the civilian garb, that the soldier is somehow set apart as the depository of pure and ruthless power.

Even the officers reveal this fact with an artlessness that would be amazing if it were not so sinister. The lawlessness of General Leonard Wood, his defiance of the War Department, his constant intrigues with newspapers and politicians, his disobedience of orders—these are the constant subject of scandalized newspaper comment. What are we to think of the remarkable interview given out on January 6, 1919, by Major General David C. Shanks, in charge of the Port of Embarkation at Hoboken, N. J., in which he "reluctantly" invited public attention to the "let-down and deterioration in discipline" on the part of Army officers returning from Europe who were absenting themselves from their final duties without leave and with a callous disregard for military orders and the welfare of their men? What are we to think of that remarkable chapter in the history of the British Army in which the officers stationed in Ireland flatly refused to obey the orders of the British government to seize the arms secreted in Belfast by the self-styled "Ulster Volunteers"? What are we to think of the disclosures in France of the Boulanger episode, of the lawlessness displayed by the French military machine in the Dreyfus case? How are we to explain the Zabern incident? These are all too easily explained if you accept the evidence of history from the time of the Roman legions down to today, that the military caste despises the civilian tradition and is its instinctive and hereditary foe.

No, I am opposed to compulsory military training because it is a reactionary military measure with the sole objective of committing us to the outworn and discredited Prussian method of keeping the peace; because it menaces the permanent settlement of international relations on a friendly and mutually helpful basis; because it means (and will be understood all over the world to mean) the mobilization of our entire man-power for that "next war" so dear to the

militarist's heart; because it means the creation of a powerful military class already too well entrenched in Washington and the metropolitan press; because it would waste the time of millions of youths who would otherwise be reaching earnest hands for a grasp on the ladder of civil and industrial life; because it would subject millions of youths to a pitiless and stupid military discipline, with the liability of severe penitentiary sentences for unimportant offences; because it is, in essence, the heart and core of militarism which Webster's Dictionary defines, you know, as "the spirit and temper which exalts the military virtues and ideals and minimizes the defects of military training and the cost of war and the preparation for it."

January 28th, 1919

Gentlemen :

The proofs which you sent me were forwarded to me in Washington where I had no time to go over them and upon my arrival in New York this morning, find I am compelled to leave on the Twentieth Century for Chicago.

The proofs have been turned over to Mr. Lloyd Taylor, for his perusal in the hope that he will be able to supply the rebuttal asked for.

Very truly yours

HENRY L. WEST,

Executive Secretary.

### COMMENT

By LLOYD TAYLOR

*Chairman, Universal Military Instruction and Training Committee,  
National Security League*

It is impossible to answer Mr. Hallinan's "argument," it being based entirely on the idea that universal military training is a militaristic proposition. The National Security League denies this, contending, with many leaders of thought of the country, that a citizenry trained to arms is purely a question of sense and defense.

The best method for carrying out the principle of universal military training is a proper question for argument. The National Security League two years ago endorsed the so-called Chamberlain Bill because it believed at that time that that measure embodied the result of the best thought on the subject. The League is now preparing, and will shortly make public, a plan devised by its officers, which is a combination of instruction and actual training, which will obviate many of the familiar objections to universal military training, viz: taking young men out of industry, maintaining an unwieldy, expensive standing army, etc.

When the question of universal training is taken up by Congress there will be many bills introduced on the subject, and Congress will decide out of this mass of evidence what is the best system for training our youths to a duty which is theirs, and which must be accepted by all when their country is in danger. If we adopt such a system our standing army need be very small,—100,000 or 150,000. We do not need for our reserves more than a million and a half or two million men, and the reserves would all be under twenty-six years of age. But, in time, we would have every able-bodied citizen trained and ready to answer a call, to the extent of many millions. A very short period of training in the nineteenth year, with practically no thought given to militarism in the years previous to this at school, will never cultivate a militaristic idea in this country. The gathering of all classes in the camps will do much to kill sectionalism and foster Americanism. It is the essence of democracy.

I believe that today we have three million young men entirely in favor of military training, and presumably six million parents, for they have felt and seen the beneficial effect of such training upon the young men.

## REBUTTAL

By MR. HALLINAN

My opponent starts out with the sweeping assertion that one's citizenship is "everything or nothing". That is interesting. There is a well-defined body of political thinking, known today as Prussianism, which starts out with precisely the same assumption. But to the Western democracies, this notion that one's relationship to the State is all or nothing, is decidedly debatable. One's relationship to the State is, after all, only one of a number of relationships. To say that it must be "everything or nothing" either sounds silly, like the suggestion that one's relationship to the village fire department must be "everything or nothing", or else it sounds menacing, a dogma with infinite seeds of disaster in it.

But not content with this, my opponent proceeds recklessly to annex the dangerous Palmerstonian doctrine, that one's citizenship should ipso facto guarantee him the armed protection and intervention of his country in whatever part of the world he *and his investments* may go.

It is, as I have said, purely an imperialistic war cry. It is rarely appealed to for the protection of lives, and never for the lives of humble citizens; it is always appealed to for the protection of investments. If this theory, then, is rooted, not in a sound nationalism but in the economic needs of a relatively small group, why should we be in a hurry to base our whole military and foreign policy upon it? If we *want* war, if we simply *lust* for it, we can have all we want.

I confess I was deeply interested in what my opponent had to say about the model which the Swiss system sets for us,—a model which, as I have pointed out, we show not the slightest signs of adopting! I was especially moved by his tribute to the effectiveness of the tiny Swiss system which, he says, kept the whole German war machine—nine millions strong—at bay. What a mighty thing is the Swiss system, if 400,000 citizens enjoying its benefits can hold at bay 9,000,000 men,—who were also trained under universal training! If my opponent proves anything does he not prove too much? If it is the Swiss training poured into an army of 400,000 men which has held 9,000,000 men at bay, why couldn't we, with an army of 400,000 men trained under this magic system, hold 9,000,000 men at bay? The fallacy is apparent. No, he knows perfectly well that Switzerland's neutrality was NOT protected by the Swiss army. He knows that Switzerland was protected from invasion by Germany because the Alps made an invasion an unpromising military undertaking and because a *neutral* Switzerland, right at her back door, was vastly more useful to Germany from every point of view than an invaded and unneutral Switzerland. Again I say, let us bury decently this overworked and specious claim.

But my opponent goes still further and fares worse. To bolster up his argument for a huge standing army of conscripts, backed by an immense conscript reserve, he adopts the argument elaborated by Bernhardi that wars are inevitable. Simply inevitable. What does Bernhardi say? "The efforts directed toward the suppression of War are \* \* \* Utopian. Universal peace would be possible only in a World Empire and this is impossible." My opponent echoes him,—*"this is impossible."*

Now I submit that in the modern, scientific, constructive, *radically democratic* world, the croakers who say that a socially desirable thing is impossible, carry upon their careless shoulders an enormous burden of proof. I suspect that their gratuitous pessimism reflects merely the point of view of a class professionally devoted to War, or a class which makes money out of War, or a class—like that of the "statesmen" of the old school—which bears such a purely romantic relationship to it as to escape from all realistic sense of its stupidity, horror and waste. What is this WAR GOD to whom we must supinely offer our youth to be maimed, tortured and destroyed?

In Europe the iron core of this determination to abolish the economic causes of war is called "Bolshevism" but over here we shall probably call it "common sense". It is the common sense of the world which is beginning to assert that a devastating war which has to be followed by a protracted peace conference might have been avoided by the process of taking the peace conference first and omitting the war! Crude, ridiculous common-sense! setting at naught the pretensions of premiers and diplomats! No, before we hastily conclude that we are bound forever in this treadmill, let us see whether the resolute republics of Europe, under the leadership of President Wilson, are not going to work out a universal scheme for resolving international difficulties precisely as the difficulties between *any two states in any federal system*—be it the United States, or Australia or the German Empire—are peaceably resolved, by a common constitution, by judicial and legislative machinery, by the rules of equity and custom, by joint give and take.

So I assert that while the length of our coastline does not matter, our spirit does. If we enter the League of Nations in good faith, if we do our share in a spirit of helpfulness, we can make the new day a reality. But if we should listen to our jingo press, if we should begin to mobilize our entire man power for that "next war" that Leonard Wood harangues the Kansas Legislature about, we would breed distrust of us everywhere, we would be throwing our immense weight in the scales on the side of the old, discredited order of competing armaments, growing vaster and vaster until they toppled once again in a common ruin.

If we need a small army, our own military experts assure us that we can recruit a suitable army by volunteer methods precisely as we recruit men for the navy, that conditions in the Army can, without the slightest loss in military efficiency, be so modernized as to make the service attractive to men.

No, the pessimism of the Bernhardi school will not daunt the civilian spirit of the modern world. There is nothing the matter with the old regime except that it has proved a colossal failure! It must and will be scrapped. I do not believe that the American people can be beguiled by the profiteers and the patrioteers into adopting at this time the Old World system of peace time conscription in preparation for the "next war" which the *peoples* themselves are determined shall never occur.

---

## INTROSPECTION

*"To thine own self be true."*

What should a thoroughly religious person think about war?

That it is a necessity approved of God as in the Old Testament: "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbor."? (Ex. xxxii. 27) Or as a blot upon civilization that can be removed by man's ingenuity?

Do we expect another war with Germany within 25 years? Or with our allies?

Can we obtain greater security by preparing for defense against an unknown enemy than by conquering a known enemy, like poverty, among our own people?

Among the warlike Indians, did the unarmed Quakers suffer more than the armed Puritans?

Would physical training, upon roads or other public works, serve every purpose as satisfactorily as military training?

Is it possible to create an international morality, or is there a tribal God for each country?



If "nations have learned that the hope of ultimate salvation rests with their man-power," should we still retain the motto, "In God we trust"?

Are there methods of preventing invasion other than by force? Could a propaganda of good-will be made as effective as one of deviltry?

Must the practical and the ideal always be mutually exclusive, or is the ideal way of living often the most practical?

Granting that *Church* and state should be separate in each country, can not *Religion* and Government be affiliated in both national and international affairs?

---

## INTELLECTUAL HOSPITALITY.

By THEODORE SCHROEDER.

To have some intelligent appreciation of how much of the knowable is yet unknown, conduces to that humility which is the beginning of wisdom. To know something of the past struggles for human progress conduces to an appreciation of how little is probably true of what we think we know. Thus to see our attainments in their true relations to past beliefs and their probable relation to future knowledge, conduces to a true measure of our great ignorance. To have this, is to be without censure, because without a stupid pride; to love truth more than our vain predispositions; to love harmlessness of life more than moral sentimentalism; to be free from phariseism, because knowing the diversity and uncertainty of standards; to be unafraid of new evidence, and unoppressive toward new allegations of truth; to be controlled by a selfishness of so high an order that your greatest happiness comes from studying all problems from the impersonal viewpoint, and making all judgments by impersonal standards; to have the desire *to be right* always overpowering the desire that others *esteem* us to be so; never to impose one's opinion by invasive force; never to be impatient, except, perhaps with dogmatism and intolerance—this is the essence of intellectual hospitality. In addition to this, if you have that rare disposition to make a substantial sacrifice for defending the right to be heard, of those whose opinions you disapprove, that would be so rare a virtue as to be almost heroic.

*Mr. Schroeder was one of the first to testify, with a subscription, that he recognized in our new venture a partial exemplification of his ideal, so eloquently expressed above. He has now supplied us with pamphlets, the choice of which we offer free to subscribers, on receipt of a kind word and two cents for postage.*

*Blasphemy and Free Speech.*

*Differential Essence of Religion.*

*Free Speech in the U. S. by Courtenay Lemon.*

---

## RELIGIOUS BOOKS

*Religion for To-day*, by John Haynes Holmes (Dodd, Mead & Co., \$1.50) 50 cents to any present or new subscriber.

*Profits of Religion*, by Upton Sinclair. Probably the most interesting book on religion ever written (50 cents). 25 cents to *new* subscribers.

*Readings from Great Authors*, prepared for responsive reading in churches, etc. (50 cents) 25 cents to new subscribers.

Address P. O. Box 42, Wall Street Station, New York City, with a remittance of \$1 for a year, or 25 cents for 3 months.

---

## IF YOU SUBSCRIBE

to THE ARBITRATOR you may select one of the following pamphlets:

The New Social Order in America, by Hornell Hart.

The Healing of Hate, by John Haynes Holmes.

Peace or Armed Peace, by Amos Pinchot.

The Individual and the State, by Roger N. Baldwin.



## SOCIAL AGENCIES

*Any organization intended to promote social betterment or reform may have one three-line insertion in this column free with a year's subscription. Additional listings, \$1 each.*

NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY, 14 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. and branches in principal cities. Object: To secure an amendment to the United States Constitution enfranchising women.

WORKERS DEFENSE UNION, Room 405, No. 7 East 15th Street, New York City. To defend men and women prosecuted on account of their activity in the labor movement and to secure the liberation of any persons unjustly imprisoned in consequence of such activity.

THE PUBLIC, 122 East 37th St., N. Y. C., a weekly journal of democracy, interpreting for its readers the developments of the day.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY, 803 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., seeks the political organization of the working class to help achieve the ownership and management of the state, the industries and education, by the people, with no thought of profit.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENTIST, 622 Audubon Building, New Orleans, La., a monthly magazine published in the interests of scientific religion and social reform.

INTERNATIONAL FREE TRADE LEAGUE, 38 St. Botolph Street, Boston. Urges the abolition of customs tariffs, and the adoption of "Free Trade, Peace, Good-will among nations." Now offers the book of the hour, *Pax Economica* by Henri Lambert, being a sketch of the only possible conclusive settlement of the problem confronting the world. 75 cents.

COMMISSION ON THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL SERVICE, of the Federal Council of Churches, 105 East 22nd Street, New York City.

AMERICAN SOCIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION, 105 West 40th Street, N. Y. C. For the repression of prostitution, the reduction of venereal diseases, and the promotion of sound sex education. Memberships include quarterly magazine and monthly bulletin.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 1440 E. 57th St., Chicago, interprets democracy religiously—our duty in religious education in Families, Schools, Churches, Colleges, Communities.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. With International Relations Section. Keen editorial comment on current events.

RECONSTRUCTION, 118 East 28th St., New York City, a new magazine published to constitute a mouthpiece through which those who desire a reconstruction worth while may speak.

SERVICE BUREAU, Corner Fifteenth and G Streets, Washington, D. C. Information available as to officials, function, and location of all Government departments.

WOMAN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City. American Section of international committee of women for permanent peace.

THE NATIONAL NONPARTISAN LEAGUE. Get the truth concerning this organization. Send 40c for special bundle of League papers and pamphlets. Address The National Nonpartisan League, Box 495, St. Paul, Minn.

# ARBITRARY RESOLUTIONS

## GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

**Resolved** that it is incumbent upon us to observe strict rules of justice towards individuals, and never break the law ourselves nor suppress freedom of speech for purposes of expediency, provided there is no criticism of existing conditions, or of any City, State or Federal institutions.

## CAPITALISTS

**Resolved** that we fail to see any way in which the laboring classes have been unfairly treated, and we therefore prefer to take our chances of a violent revolution rather than make any concessions which will reduce our emoluments.

## SOCIALISTS

**Resolved** that we stand for liberty of opinion, and if any member shall fail to vote the straight Socialist ticket, he shall be turned out of the party.

## CONSERVATIVES

**Resolved** that the world is perfect as it is, and anyone who strives to change it by one jot or one tittle is a Bolshevik.

## LIBERALS

**Resolved** that we will never use violence nor break the laws, but will educate the people to the realization that they can make the world what they want it to be, peacefully; for there can be no laws "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble."

## LAWYERS AND JUDGES

**Resolved** that we substitute blue for red tape, but continue to administer justice so that all men receive identical treatment whether rich or poor.

## EMPLOYERS

**Resolved** that the supply of laborers must be increased by encouragement of large families so that the workers shall be obliged to accept wage representing a bare subsistence.

## EMPLOYERS

**Resolved** that we will trust the world to grow, voluntarily, a fair share of surplus product without any strikes or other action on our part.

## ARISTOCRATS

**Resolved** that deference shall be shown by the poor and lowly to those of our class, regardless of relative superiority in the sight of God.

## ORTHODOX

**Resolved** that those who hold firm to the accepted principles of any church are estimable and Godly, whereas those who investigate doctrines of ancient times, in the light of modern knowledge, with a view to establishing a new faith, are atheists.

## MILITARISTS

**Resolved** that we reaffirm our belief in the right of the Government to conscript the labor of all citizens for war; but not their property for that or any other purpose.

## PACIFISTS

**Resolved** that we will show our love for country by personal sacrifices calculated to make America more than ever the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Subscriptions have come in from all parts of the country; from ministers, libraries, colleges, working men and social agencies, and we need you as one who seeks the true way of living and is willing to hear the ideas of others.

\$1. a year; 25 cents for three months; 10 cents a copy.

A copy of "Religion for To-day" by John Haynes Holmes (\$1.50) will be supplied to subscribers for fifty cents. Upton Sinclair's "Profits of Religion" (50 cents) 25 cents to new subscribers.

To THE ARBITRATOR P. O. Box 42, Wall St. Station, N. Y.

Date.....

Please send The Arbitrator for.....months, for which find enclosed.....

Also send.....Total \$.....

Name.....

Address.....



Gaylord Bros.  
Makers  
Syracuse, N. Y.  
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

940.92

M 683

Miscellaneous pamph.

v. 20

nos. 1-3

ing on the World

940.92

M 683

v. 20

no. 1-3



